

the White House, the Vietnam War Memorial, and the National Cathedral. Through their explorations of Washington, millions of people have been exposed to, and moved by, the art work of Rick Hart.

Rick Hart was one of the world's most talented and appreciated sculptors who created many impressive pieces during his career, but it is two pieces in particular with which visitors to Washington are most familiar. Though they may have never known that these two pieces were created by Rick Hart, countless individuals have been taken by the "Creation" at the National Cathedral and "Three Soldiers" at the Vietnam War Memorial.

It is appropriate that one of Rick's most famous sculptures is to be found at the National Cathedral, for it was there that he began his career as an apprentice stone carver, working on the gargoyles that adorn the gothic structure. From the beginning of his involvement in art, it was obvious that Rick was a man of tremendous talent and creativity. This was proven unquestionably when at age thirty-one his design for a sculpture to adorn the west facade of the Cathedral was picked after an international call for submissions.

One decade after his design for the National Cathedral was accepted, his emotion evoking sculpture of "Three Soldiers" was dedicated in November of 1984 as a supplement to the Vietnam War Memorial. It certainly must have been a challenge for this artist to go from creating a work that helped to express the glory of creation and God with a work that stands as a reminder to those who served and died in Vietnam. Not surprisingly, Rick rose to the challenge and sculpted what has become one of the most recognized and respected military sculptures in the world, and one that helps to pay appropriate homage to all those who participated in that conflict.

All that Rick accomplished in his life is that much more impressive given his humble and hard beginnings. Born in Atlanta, Georgia, Rick lost his mother at an early age and was reared in rural South Carolina for much of his young life, until he and his father moved to Washington. Rick was a bright man with both his hands and his mind, and his exceedingly high Scholastic Aptitude Test scores allowed his entrance in college at the young age of sixteen. Just as many who have been born and raised in the South have done, Rick chose to return "home", and he enrolled in the University of South Carolina as a philosophy student. Rick's higher education also include studies at the Corcoran and American University, where ironically, he was scheduled to give the commencement address at next year's graduation and to be awarded an honorary degree.

My chief of Staff, R.J. "Duke" Short, his wife Dee, and our good friend Harry Sacks have been friends of Rick for many years, and it was they who intro-

duced me to Rick back in 1995. Rick generously and graciously volunteered to create a bust of me which has been donated to the United States Senate and is on display not far from this Chamber, in Senate-238, also known as "The Strom Thurmond Room." In order to script by bust, Rick and I spent a considerable amount of time together. Rick was a warm, outgoing, and humble man and it was obvious that creating works of art was a passion for him.

Though still very young, only in his fifties, Rick suffered a serious health setback last year when he was felled with a stroke. Strong and vital, Rick was making an impressive recovery when he was admitted to Johns Hopkins Hospital in August to be treated for pneumonia. Tragically, doctors discovered that his body has been overtaken by cancer and he had quite literally only days to live. His death was sudden, unexpected, and tragic, and has left all of us pondering how someone so vital could be taken at such a young age. His passing saddens all who knew him and his death leaves a tremendous void in the American art community. My condolences and sympathies are with his wife Lindy and sons Alexander and Lain. While their husband and father may no longer be here, Frederick "Rick" Hart has achieved a kind of immortality through his great works of art.

SUPERFUND RECYCLING EQUITY ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, over the past three decades, concern for our environment and natural resources has grown—as has the desire to recycle and reuse. You may be surprised to learn that one major environmental statue actually creates an impediment to recycling. Superfund has created this impediment, although unintended by the law's authors.

Because of the harm that is being done to the recycling effort by the unintended consequence of law, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. DASCHLE, and I introduced the Superfund Recycling Equity Act, S. 1528. This bill removes Superfund's recycling impediments and increases America's recycling rates.

We had one and only one purpose in introducing the Superfund Recycling Equity Act—to remove from the liability loop those who collect and ship recyclables to a third party site. The bill is not intended to plow new Superfund ground, nor is it intended to revamp existing Superfund law. That task is appropriately left to comprehensive reform, a goal that I hope is achievable.

While the bill proposes to amend Superfund, Mr. President, it is really a recycling bill. Recycling is not disposal and shipping for recycling is not arranging for disposal—it is a relatively simple clarification, but one that is necessary to maintain a successful re-

cycling effort nationwide. Without this clarification, America will continue to fall short of its recycling goal.

S. 1528 was negotiated in 1993 between representatives of the industry that recycles traditional materials—paper, glass, plastic, metals, textiles and rubber—and representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Justice, and the national environmental community. Similar language has been included in virtually every comprehensive Superfund bill since 1994. With nearly 50 Senate cosponsors, support for the bill has been both extensive and bipartisan.

Since Senator DASCHLE and I introduced S. 1528, some have argued that we should not "piecemeal" Superfund. They argue that every part of Superfund should be held together tightly, until a comprehensive approach to reauthorization is found. And given the broad-based support for the recycling piece across both parties, some think it should be held as a "sweetener" for some of the more difficult issues. Superfund's long history suggests, however, that the recycling provisions—as sweet as they are—have done little, if anything, to help move a comprehensive Superfund bill forward. Rather, "sweeteners" like brownfields and municipal liability are what keep all parties at the table.

Holding the recyclers hostage to a comprehensive bill has not helped reform Superfund, and continuing to hold them hostage will not ensure action in the future. What it does ensure is that recycling continues to be impeded and fails to attain our nation's goals.

This recycling fix is minuscule compared to the overwhelming stakeholder needs regarding Superfund in general, but so significant for the recycling industry itself. It is easy to see why this bill has achieved such widespread bipartisan support among our colleagues.

S. 1528 addresses only one Superfund issue—the unintended consequence of law that holds recyclers responsible for the actions of those who purchase their goods. The goal of this bill is to remove the liability facing recyclers, not to establish who should be responsible for those shares if the unintended liability is removed.

Senator DASCHLE and I have heard from various parties who want to add minor provisions outside the scope of the bill. Although many have presented interesting and often compelling arguments, I will continue to ask that any party wishing to enlarge the narrow focus of S. 1528 show support on both sides of the aisle, as well as from the administration and the environmental community.

Much time, energy and expertise went into crafting an agreement where few thought it was possible. That agreement has been maintained through four separate Congresses where all sorts of attempts to modify it have failed. Congress should accept this delicately crafted product.

S. 1528 shows Congress' commitment to protect and increase recycling.

S. 1528 repeats what we all know and support—that continued and expanded recycling is a national goal.

S. 1528 removes impediments to achieving this goal, impediments Congress never intended to occur.

The nearly 50 Senators who have already co-sponsored this bill recognize the need to amend Superfund for the very important purpose of increasing recycling in the public interest. Let's act this year.

MODERNIZATION OF THE ABM TREATY

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I rise today on a substantive issue which has caused me considerable concern recently. It has to do with the issue of our national missile defense and the fact we passed legislation earlier this year on that subject, and we now hear the administration discussing its options under the National Missile Defense Act. We hear responses from around the world about the intent we have that is now in our law to deploy a limited national defense system. I want to speak on that subject for a minute or two.

When we passed the National Missile Defense Act, we all realized, and the President did, too, when he signed it, that the ABM Treaty, the antiballistic missile defense treaty, that exists between the United States and Russia, prohibits the deployment of a national missile defense system and that the treaty would have to be amended if it was to remain in force.

Some statements being made on the subject now by our own administration, as well as by Russian officials, cause me considerable concern. For example, the Secretary of State recently said that the administration was examining "the possibility of adjusting [the ABM Treaty] slightly in order to have a National Missile Defense."

Since article I of the treaty expressly prohibits a national missile defense, the Secretary's suggestion that only a slight adjustment is required in the treaty language is a huge understatement, and it is likely to mislead the Russians and others as well.

The National Missile Defense Act acknowledges our policy of pursuing arms control arrangements, but it requires the deployment of a limited national missile defense which contradicts the initial premise of the ABM Treaty.

A number of Russian Government officials have said they will not negotiate changes in the ABM Treaty. A Russian foreign ministry spokesman has been quoted as saying it is "absolutely unacceptable to make any changes in the key provisions of the treaty and the Russian side does not intend to depart from this position."

A Russian defense ministry official has said: "There can be no compromise on this issue."

Additionally, it has been reported that Russian and Chinese Government

representatives have introduced a resolution in the U.N. General Assembly demanding the United States forego deployment of a missile defense system and strictly comply with the treaty's prohibition on territorial defense.

It is entirely inappropriate for the U.N. to consider seriously a resolution that would presume to dictate to the United States what we should or should not do in defense of our own national security. Ballistic missile threats are real and have caused our Government to adopt a policy that requires a deployed national missile defense.

It is my fervent hope our own Government will acknowledge clearly that the National Missile Defense Act means what it says and stop encouraging misunderstanding by the Russians, the Chinese, or anyone else of our intentions to defend ourselves against ballistic missile attack. We also hope the point will be made that we are not trying to undermine or threaten Russia's missile deterrent.

Our relationship with Russia has improved considerably in recent years. I hope this new era of mutual respect and understanding will continue to be strengthened. We are getting into an unfortunate situation, however, where candor and honest exchange of information and intentions are taking a back seat to half-truths and bluster. The latter course will lead to misunderstanding and possibly disaster. At no time in the history of the relationship have honesty and unequivocal dialog been more important between Russia and the United States. The ABM Treaty is out of date and must be changed to reflect today's realities. The sooner everyone acknowledges this fact and gets busy negotiating the changes that are required, the better off we will all be.

CHARLES BATTAGLIA

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I would like to comment about a distinguished American who is retiring from service in the U.S. Senate. Charles Battaglia has been associated with me in the Senate for the past 14 years. He came to help me as an assistant when I served on the Intelligence Committee and stayed with me to become staff director of the Intelligence Committee during the 104th Congress when I chaired that committee, and then, in the 105th Congress, moved over with me to be the staff director when I chaired the Veterans Affairs Committee through the first session of the 106th Congress.

Mr. Battaglia has a distinguished record. Following graduation from Boston College, he served 25 years in the U.S. Navy, serving in the offices of the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Navy, and the Naval War College. In 1978, Mr. Battaglia was selected by the Director of Central Intelligence, Adm. Stansfield Turner, to be his special assistant at CIA. He received his MBA

from Bryant University, and in 1991 completed the Kennedy School of Government's international security program, was a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and has an extraordinarily distinguished military record in the Navy, in the intelligence community and CIA, as an assistant on the Intelligence Committee, and later as staff director there.

He has earned retirement status. I might say we are making some effort to bring him back on a contract part-time basis to help with our inquiry into alleged espionage and other matters on oversight at the Department of Justice.

He has had an extraordinary record and become a personal friend of mine in the intervening 14 years. He has done great service for the military and as a member of the Senate family.

I yield the floor.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, October 22, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,674,164,714,443.85 (Five trillion, six hundred seventy-four billion, one hundred sixty-four million, seven hundred fourteen thousand, four hundred forty-three dollars and eighty-five cents).

One year ago, October 22, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,548,924,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred forty-eight billion, nine hundred twenty-four million).

Fifteen years ago, October 22, 1984, the Federal debt stood at \$1,591,515,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred ninety-one billion, five hundred fifteen million).

Twenty-five years ago, October 22, 1974, the Federal debt stood at \$479,517,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-nine billion, five hundred seventeen million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,194,647,714,443.85 (Five trillion, one hundred ninety-four billion, six hundred forty-seven million, seven hundred fourteen thousand, four hundred forty-three dollars and eighty-five cents) during the past 25 years.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it request the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2. An act to send dollars to the classroom and for certain other purposes.

H.R. 2300. An act to allow to a State combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2. An act to send dollars to the classroom and for certain other purposes; to the